Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1 and 6-9, 11, and 13-16 are pending in the application.

Claim 16 is canceled.

Claims 17-21 are newly added.

Claims 1, 6-7, 11, and 13-15 are hereby amended.

1.   Claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to comply with the specification as regards the non-standard data. Support for the amendment is found, for example, at p. 7, lines 3-6 of the specification.

Applicant's amended claim 7 clarifies that "CDPD" is, in fact, as the examiner has assumed, the acronym for cellular digital packet data which Applicant respectfully submits would be understood and recognized by those skilled in the art at the time of the claimed invention per amended claim 7.

Amended claim 11 clarifies that the hooking layer directly translates the non-standard data at the client device.

The amendments to claims 13 and 14 delete the element of a "translator" of the server and clarify that the server has capability to communicate via the specialized wireless protocol over the wireless link and via the standard network protocol over the standard network link. Support for the amendment is found, for example, on p. 5, lines 22-p. 6, line 18, of the specification.

Claim 16 is canceled.

2.   Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as invention.

Amended claims 1 and 6-9 recite only "specialized" protocols.

Applicant's amendment to claim 11 clarifies that the hooking layer directly translates the non-standard data at the client device.

Amended claim 13 clarifies that communications are "between" the client and server.

Claim 16 is cancelled.

3.   Claims 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruno. Bruno discloses only a wired LAN or POTS connection of an H.320 protocol channel for communications of TCP/IP formatted data encapsulated in an H.320 protocol for the communications between an accessing terminal and a gateway server.

Applicant's amended claims specifically and distinctly point out that communications between client and server are over wireless link according to non-standard specialized/optimized wireless protocols including non-standard data, different from the standard network protocols (e.g., TCP/IP) and standard data (e.g., TCP/IP data or as operable as standard for the program). At the client, these non-standard optimized wireless protocols including non-standard data are selectively hooked using specialized sockets and made available for the application program as standard data for the application program. The switch of the hooking layer as to the specialized sockets and standard sockets accounts for received non-standard wireless protocols and formats, on the on the one hand, and also standard protocols and formats, on the other hand. This

allows the application program to operate in conjunction with communications between the server and client.

4.　　Claims 1, 6-9, 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruno in view of Blankenship.　Bruno discloses only a translation occurring at the gateway server (i.e., from TCP/IP to TCP/IP encapsulated within H.320 protocols for communication to the access terminal), not at the access terminal.　The program of the access terminal operates with the TCP/IP protocol data and merely strips this data from within the H.320 protocols communicated with the gateway server.　There is not any translation of any specialized data and protocols in order to arrive at the standard data for the Bruno access terminal.

The program of Blankenship's wireless device operates with data received from the web server that has been "converted" (i.e., to wireless application protocol data) to form for communication to the wireless device.　The converted form is the "accepted" form for use by the wireless device, via the program of the wireless device having capability to operate with the converted form of the data.　Blankenship does not teach or suggest that the program of the wireless device could or would be operable with the data of the original (i.e., standard form); rather, the program of the wireless device is capable of operating with the converted data itself (i.e., the WAP protocol and data).　In order to operate with the WAP protocol and data, the wireless device has a special program of the wireless device that interprets and uses WML.　The wireless device does not actually translate the converted form of the data back to the standard protocols and data, but instead the program uses the WAP protocol and data.

The cited combination does not teach or suggest communications between client and server, wherein the communications are according to non-standard optimized wireless protocols of specialized data that is different from standard network protocols of standard data. The application program of the client device, however, operates with standard data. At the client device, therefore, the hooking layer serves to enable operations of the program with standard data, notwithstanding that the non-standard optimized wireless protocols of specialized data is communicated between client and server for use by the client and application program at the clien (albeit in standard form, once hooked at the client).

5.   Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruno. Claim 16 is canceled.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all remaining claims, as here amended.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the undersigned attorney for Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any issues. The Office is authorized to charge any excess fees or to credit any overage to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2008

By: /H. Dale Langley, Jr./
H. Dale Langley, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,927

The Law Firm of H. Dale Langley, Jr.
610 West Lynn
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: (512) 477-3830
Facsimile: (512) 480-0858
E-Mail: dlangley@iptechlaw.com